

Appl. No. 09/844,466
Amendment After Final dated July 27, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 24, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant thanks Examiner Gyorf for the telephone interview on July 26, 2005, with the undersigned regarding this application. Claims 1, 28, and 46-50 were discussed, and the references cited in the May 24, 2005, Office action were discussed.

Claims 1-28, 37-38, and 46-50 were considered in the Office action dated May 24, 2005. The Office action rejects these claims.

Applicant hereby cancels claims 15-27, 37, and 38 without prejudice, reserving the right to introduce the subject matter of any or all of these claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional applications. Applicant amends claims 1 and 28 as reflected in the Listing of Claims. The amendment is supported in the application as originally filed, for example, on pages 5-6 at paragraphs [0015] to [0019] and in Figures 1-3.

Following entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-14, 28, and 46-50 will be pending in this application. Of these, claims 1 and 28 are independent claims.

Claim 1 is patentable; the cited art does not teach or suggest every element recited in claim 1.

The Office action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,982,892 (*Hicks*) and European Patent EP 0895149 (*Benson*), and further in view of *Ellson*.

Without acquiescing to the rejection(s) of the Office action, Applicants amend claim 1 as reflected in the above Listing of Claims.

None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. For example, none of the references teach granting access to a software application, thereby enabling operation of the software application with a user geometry file, wherein access is limited to execution of the software with the geometry file of an injection molded component, and where an identifier is based at least in part on the user geometry file. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable in light of the cited art. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-14 and 46-50 are patentable as well, since they include all the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 28 is patentable; the cited art does not teach or suggest every element recited in claim 28.

The Office action rejects claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,103,476 (*Waite*) and further in view of *Benson* and *Ellson*.

Without acquiescing to the rejection(s) of the Office action, Applicants amend claim 28 as reflected in the above Listing of Claims, similarly to the amendment of claim 1.

None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 28. For example, none of the references teach running an application

Appl. No. 09/844,466
Amendment After Final dated July 27, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 24, 2005

software program on a user's computer with a user geometry file, wherein access is limited to execution of the software with the geometry file of an injection molded component, and where a fingerprint file is based at least in part on the user geometry file. Therefore, claim 28 is patentable in light of the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-14, 28, and 46-50 in due course. The Examiner is hereby cordially invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at the number listed below to discuss any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 27, 2005
Reg. No. 53,002

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1013
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231



William R. Haulbrook, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicants
Goodwin Procter LLP
Exchange Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Goodwin Customer No. 051414

1568069v1